6/5/86 U2030-1

HARVARD

RRC NEWSLETTER

RUSSIAN RESEARCH CENTER

June 1, 1986 Volume X, Number 9

INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION FIGURES

Product	April 1986	Jan-Apr 1986	1st 4 Mos. 1986 as % of 1st 4 Mos. of 1985
Electricity (bil.kw.hrs)	129	566	104%
Petroleum (inc. gas cond.)(mil. metric tons)	50.2	199	102%
Natural Gas (bil.cu.mtrs)	56.2	228	107%
Coal (mil. metric tons)	63.6	258	105%
Steel (mil. metric tons)	13.4	53.4	108%
Fertilizer (mil.tons)	3.0	11.7	111%
Metal-cutting tools (mil. rubles)	234	951	114%
Robots (in thousands)	1.2	4.7	127%
Computer Technology (bil. rubles)	0.4	1.5	118%
Tractors (mil. hpower)	4.9	18.8	106%
Paper (mil. metric tons)	2.9	11.5	109%
Cement (mil. metric tons)	11.2	44.0	108%
Meat(mil. metric tons)	0.7	3.5	108%
Margarine (1000 tons)	132	537	105%
Watches(mils.)	6.0	23.4	106%
Radios (millions)	0.8	3.0	107%
T.V. sets (millions)	0.8	3.2	105%
Automobiles (1000s)	113	446	100.4%

Industrial production for the first four months of 1986 continues to show improvement over the same period in 1985. While the overall rate of growth seems to have diminished a bit from what it was during the first three months of the year, the growth is still impressive. Gorbachev himself pointed out that the first three months of 1985 were particularly harsh, both in terms of weather and in terms of output. Thus any comparison for 1986 will automatically look better than it may actually be. Nonetheless the growth is still striking. While steel production for April 1986 only increased 2% over April 1985, the other indices are impressive and, of course, for the whole four month period, steel production was up 8%. That is down from the 10% and 11% of the earlier part of the year, but still quite a respectable growth period.

Most impressive of all, however, is the fact that petroleum production continues to grow. For the whole four month period it is up 2%, and on an April to April basis, it is up 2.5%. The commentary which accompanies the production statistics indicates that the Ministry of Petroleum is still not meeting its

planned targets, but they are complemented for having increased production.

It will be interesting to see what happens with next month's figures. The Chernobyl explosion took place April 26 and presumably that should have some impact, at least on electricity production. As it is, electricity production for April 1986 over April 1985 was up 3%. It had been increasing at a rate of 4% prior to April, but indeed, as we saw, steel production is down as well, so it would be un- fair to attribute the slight drop to the events at Chernobyl.

--*-*-*

LIVESTOCK HERDS
(in millions)

	May 1 1985	May 1 1986	1986 as % of 1985
Cattle	98.3	98.9	101%
Cows	29.6	29.3	99%
Hogs	57.4	58.9	103%
Sheep & Goats	143.6	146.5	102%
Chickens	787.8	802.2	102%

LIVESTOCK HERDS SEEM TO HAVE INCREASED

The livestock herds seem to have increased in May 1986 over earlier months this year. The number of cows is down by about 1%, but most of the other animal herds have increased. This is a change from the conditions that prevailed earlier.

==========
THE RUSSIAN RESEARCH CENTER takes no official stand on any economic or political trend. The views and analyses expressed in this Newsletter are those of the authors directly associated with the article, or unless otherwise stated, with those of the editors, Marshall I. Goldman and Catherine Reed. RRC @ 1986
==========

Summary: Professor Katerina Clark, Indiana University
"The Changing Image of Science and Technology in Soviet Literature"

Professor Clark argues that, for a number of historical and ideological reasons, science and technology are particularly important themes in Soviet literature. The early history of Soviet attitudes to these questions is informed by a scientific Prometheanism and technological utopianism, but in Bolshevik ideology these have been in dialectical conflict with an anti-intellectualism which favors the plebean and warrior classes and a "closed society." In examining the impact of this conflict on literature, Clark isolates two alternating patterns: the first is of a literature that stresses transformation and efficiency, values science and technological progress, and is obsessed with the West; the second is of a literature that has turned inward, focuses on the present or the past, and is not particularly concerned with science and technology, but emphasizes rather the class struggle or some other struggle with the enemies of the state. While these patterns hold only at a high level of generalization, they help catch the way Marxism-Leninism's scientism interacts dialogically with other currents in the Russian intellectual tradition.

During War Communism, the most utopian period in Soviet history, debate over Bolshevik commitment to modernization and urbanization was reflected in two antithetical literary trends. The first looked to the triumph of science and technology and to an age when man would be at one not with nature, but with the machine(eg. Proletcult literature). Counterposed to this tendency were a range of works expressing apprehension about modernization(such as those by Kliuev, Pilniak and Ivanov-Razumnik); these included several anti-urbanist utopias (Chayanov, Esenin) and anti-utopias (Zamyatin, Lunts). During NEP, however, this debate faded from view somewhat; literature was concerned less with the issues of technological progress than it was with struggle with enemies, and with the Civil War in particular. An important exception to this trend is F. Gladkov's Cement, a crucial work in that in the thirties and forties it came to be the model for that mainstay of Stalinist literature, the production novel. But Cement shares with other literature of its time a quasi-military ethos and an emphasis on "struggle" and winning through against all odds, which transformed what should have been fiction about production processes into a tale of individual, superhuman exploit.

During the First Five-Year Plan, the first pattern predominated in literature, once again, as it focussed on radical change through accelerated industrialization, on the wonders of electrification, and the need to "remake" society, with technology proposed as an "answer to everything." For the rest of the Stalin period, however, literature again looked more to the struggle with internal enemies, to the great struggles of the past or to those being waged within Soviet institutions. Even novels which were ostensibly about production were structured as sagas of "the struggle with nature," which was itself not self-valuable, but an allegory for political progress. In the late forties and early fifties technological progress returned once again as a theme, but once again, as in Cement, the emphasis was on the hero who could defy "reality." In contrast to the patterns of Cement, however, the importance of experts and specialists began to be stressed.

This emphasis on expertise increased over time, and by the Khrushchev years the first pattern again came to the fore. Most literature was preoccupied with how to modernize and make the economy rational and efficient,

and a common trait of the negative character was that he was poorly educated. As the scientist and inventor reemerged as hero, and literature began to champion professionalism in science, it took issue with three prejudices of the Stalinist phase: that science must subordinate objectivity to dialectical materialism; that scientists and intellectuals are "bourgeois"; and that theoretical science must be subordinated to the applied.

From the mid-1960s to the mid-1970s, the second pattern emerged again in reaction to the cult of technology and efficiency of the Khrushchev era: "byt" prose, war fiction and "village prose" were all either not interested in, or opposed to, technological progress; they were not forward looking, and were concerned about the ecology and preservation of traditions rather than change. An official reaction against such "retrograde" tendencies set in in the late seventies, and continues to this day. Thus a return to the first pattern might be expected. However, that heady technological utopianism of the innocent revolutionary days is no longer possible (and especially since the threat of nuclear disaster haunts our age). Writers have been dragging their feet, and the return to the first pattern has been only partial.